

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,399	11/09/2001	Hyung Nam Han	P/2803-43	2094	
2352 7	590 09/05/2006		EXAM	INER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			ARAQUE JR	ARAQUE JR, GERARDO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3629		

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/040,399	HAN, HYUNG NAM
Examiner	Art Unit
Gerardo Araque Jr.	3629

The MAII ING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The MALING DATE of this communication appears on the cover	er sneet with the correspondence address
The amendment document filed on <u>July 3, 2006</u> is considered non-comrequirements of 37 CFR 1.121 or 1.4. In order for the amendment document item(s) is required.	
THE FOLLOWING MARKED (X) ITEM(S) CAUSE THE AMENDMENT 1. Amendments to the specification: A. Amended paragraph(s) do not include markings. B. New paragraph(s) should not be underlined. C. Other	DOCUMENT TO BE NON-COMPLIANT:
2. Abstract:A. Not presented on a separate sheet. 37 CFR 1.72.B. Other	
 3. Amendments to the drawings: A. The drawings are not properly identified in the top ma "Annotated Sheet" as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d). B. The practice of submitting proposed drawing correction showing amended figures, without markings, in comp C. Other 	on has been eliminated. Replacement drawings
 ✓ 4. Amendments to the claims: A. A complete listing of all of the claims is not present. B. The listing of claims does not include the text of all pe C. Each claim has not been provided with the proper star of each claim cannot be identified. Note: the status of number by using one of the following status identifiers (Previously presented), (New), (Not entered), (Withdraw). D. The claims of this amendment paper have not been p E. Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	tus identifier, and as such, the individual status of every claim must be indicated after its claim s: (Original), (Currently amended), (Canceled), awn) and (Withdrawn-currently amended).
5. Other (e.g., the amendment is unsigned or not signed in acc	cordance with 37 CFR 1.4):
For further explanation of the amendment format required by 37 CFR 1.	.121, see MPEP § 714.
TIME PERIODS FOR FILING A REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:	
 Applicant is given no new time period if the non-compliant amends filed after allowance. If applicant wishes to resubmit the non-compl entire corrected amendment must be resubmitted. 	
 Applicant is given one month, or thirty (30) days, whichever is long correction, if the non-compliant amendment is one of the following: (including a submission for a request for continued examination (RC amendment filed within a suspension period under 37 CFR 1.103(a Quayle action. If any of above boxes 1. to 4. are checked, the corre non-compliant amendment in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. 	a preliminary amendment, a non-final amendment CE) under 37 CFR 1.114), a supplemental or (c), and an amendment filed in response to a
Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a) only if amendment or an amendment filed in response to a Quayle action	
Failure to timely respond to this notice will result in: Abandonment of the application if the non-compliant amends filed in response to a Quayle action; or Non-entry of the amendment if the non-compliant amendment amendment.	
Legal Instruments Examiner (LIE), if applicable U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	Telephone No. Part of Paper No. 20060824
o.g., atom and Haddinen and	. all of applications

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)

Continuation of 4(e) Other: Continuation of 4(e) Other: Continuation of 5 Other: The applicant failed to properly address 35 USC 112 issue of the First Office Action on the Merits. The examiner pointed out that the term "trunk gateway" was not properly defined in the specification and informed the applicant that for the purposes of the examination "trunk gateway" would be treated to have the equivalent function of a router. However, the applicant failed to address the issue of whether the assessment was correct and canceled one of the two claims in question while amending the second claim, but not addressing the issue. The examiner would have appreciate it if the applicant would have submitted a proper explanation over how to assess the "trunk gateway."

JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600